



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/751,585	12/29/2000	Eric T. Lambert	YOR920000560US1/127-0005	8383

7590  
Philmore H. Colburn II  
Cantor Colburn LLP  
55 Griffin Road South  
Bloomfield, CT 06002

06/06/2007

EXAMINER
----------

RUDY, ANDREW J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3627

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

06/06/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/751,585  
Filing Date: December 29, 2000  
Appellant(s): LAMBERT ET AL.

**MAILED**

JUN 06 2007

**GROUP 3600**

---

Marisa J. Dubuc  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed October 18, 2006 appealing from the Office action mailed March 30, 2004.

**(1) Real Party in Interest**

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) Related Appeals and Interferences**

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

**(3) Status of Claims**

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) Status of Amendments After Final**

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

**(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed is correct.

**(7) Claims Appendix**

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

**(8) Evidence Relied Upon**

5,109,337	Ferriter et al.	4-1992
5,765,138	Aycock et al.	6-1998
6,493,685	Ensel et al.	12-2002
6,813,777	Weinberger et al.	11-2004

**(9) Grounds of Rejection**

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 40-71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. (a). This rejection is set forth in a prior Office Action, mailed on March 30, 2004. With regards to Official Notice, Weinberger is enclosed to support the Official Notice taken.

**(10) Response to Argument**


Applicant's Appeal Brief is noted. Upon review of Appellant's Brief the following is added. It is noted that Appellant's method claims does not use or manipulate any of the list of databases claimed. In short, the method for facilitating part qualification functions does not require the list of databases. *Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. V. Supermarket Equipment Corp.*, 1950, 340 US 147, 71 S.Ct. 127, 95 L.Ed. 162. "The mere aggregation of a number of old parts or elements which, in the aggregation, perform or produce no new or different function or operation than that theretofore performed or produced by them, is not patentable invention." *Lincoln Engineering Co. V. Stewart Warner Corp.*, 1938, 303 US 545, 549, 58 S.Ct. 662, 664, 82 L.Ed. 1008. "As to the rejection of the claims on the prior art references, we do not agree with the appellant that such structural limitations as are not disclosed by the references should be given patentable weight. This argument is applicable to claims drawn to structure and not claims drawn to a method. To be entitled to such weight in method claims, the

recited structural limitations therein must affect the method in a manipulative sense and not to amount to the mere claiming of a use of a particular structure, which, in our opinion, is the case here." *Ex parte Pfeiffer*, 135 USPQ 31 (BdPatApp&Int 1961).

The Official Notice traversal is acknowledged. Weinberger, US 6,813,77, is added as it discloses each of the various databases claimed by Appellant. It is the Examiner's position that each of these databases have been common knowledge in the art, as evidenced by Weinberger.

(11) *Related Proceeding(s) Appendix*  
For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,



Andrew Joseph Rudy  
May 2, 2005

Conferees

Robert P. Olszewski, SPE, AU 3627  
Hyung Sub (Sam) Sough, SPE, AU 3628



Philmore H. Colburn II  
Cantor Colburn LLP  
55 Griffin Road South  
Bloomfield, CT 06002

\* No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.